## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/743,126	ALLEN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
JAGADISHWAR R. SAMALA	1618	

	JAGADISHWAR R. SAMALA	1618		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress	
THE REPLY FILED 26 February 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.		
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:				
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.				
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.				
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(1	r).			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig	of the fee. The appropri- inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as	
	liance with 27 CER 41 27 must be	filad within two month	a of the data of	
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the AMENIAN TO.</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the		
AMENDMENTS				
<ul> <li>I. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because</li> <li>(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li> </ul>				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a control NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.		
<u> </u>	21 See attached Nation of Non Co	maliant Amandment (	DTOL 224\	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):				
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:				
Claim(s) allowed: <i>None</i> .				
Claim(s) objected to: <i>None</i> .				
Claim(s) rejected: <u>24-29 and 31-53</u> .				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>				
. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).				
10.   The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.	
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER				
1. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>				
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)			
/Michael G. Hartley/	Jagadishwar R Samala			
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1618	Examiner Art Unit: 1618			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Since the prior art(Quada Jr. et al; Weinstein et al; Camden) teaches one or more of various conventional pharmaceutical kit components, such as for e.g. containers with one or more active ingredients and flavoring agents, a composition containing one or more flavoring agents would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art to use various flavoring agents interchangeable and depending on the taste of the drug, one skilled in the art would have expected the use of different flavoring agents to be predictable for personal preference and/or to mask the taste of a particular drug.

In absence of any criticality and/or unexpected results presently claimed invention is considered obvious over the prior art of record cited above. For Applicant's convenience a publication about "flavor and Medication Flavoring Formulary System" has been enclosed with this action. This reference is about the flavoring agents applicable for all generic drugs (see page 2 of the reference).

In view of the teachings of the prior art at the time the invention was made one skilled in the art would have been motivated to use any flavoring agent or mixture of them as desired.

See KSR Supreme Court of United States Decision (Decided April 30, 2007, KSR INTERNATIONAL CO.V.TELEFLEX INC. et al. No. 04-1350) where it states that (1) "However, the issue is not whether a person skilled in the art had the motivation to combine the electronic control with an adjustable pedal assembly, but whether a person skilled in the art had the motivation to attach the electronic control to the support bracket of pedal assembly".